

REMARKS

Applicant cancels claims 1 and 2 without prejudice or disclaimer; therefore, claims 3-9 are all the claims pending in the application.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Weisshaar et al. (Weisshaar), and claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly anticipated by Weisshaar in view of Ben-Shachar et al. (Ben-Shachar). The Examiner also objects to claims 1-3 due to an allegedly incomplete recitation, namely the phrase “by wireless” (see Office Action, page 2, paragraph 1).

With regard to the Examiner’s objection to claims 1-3, this objection is addressed and overcome by replacing the phrase “by wireless” with “wirelessly”. This minor grammatical change does not narrow the scope of the claims. No estoppel is created.

Applicant rewrites claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 in independent form including all of the limitations of their respective base claims. This amendment to claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 is merely to present these claims in independent form without changing the scope of the original claims 4, 5, 7 and 8. No estoppel is created.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection of claims 3-9 as follows.

With regard to claims 3, 6 and 9, Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar describe an arrangement where service manager exports registered service objects. However, neither of these references discloses or suggests deciding which service object is to be exported based on the frequency of use of service and/or importance of service. Thus, Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar do not disclose, teach or suggest a system where priority data corresponding to each of at least one service object that is to be cached in the wireless terminal device is generated on the basis of at least one

selected from necessity, importance and frequency in use of each of the at least one service object in the wireless terminal device; the priority data is related to each of the at least one service object and cached together; the priority data is updated according to use of the at least one service object; and when the cached at least one service object overflows in order to cache a new service object in the wireless terminal device, at least one low-priority service object is deleted on the basis of the priority data, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 3.

Therefore, claim 3, as well as its dependent claims 6 and 9 (which incorporate all the novel and unobvious features of their base claim), would not have been obvious from the combination of Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar at least for this reason.

With regard to claims 4 and 5, Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar describe an arrangement where a template is used to transfer data from remote lookup service front end to back end. However, neither of these references discloses or suggests selecting, for example, only necessary information, or performing compression, to transfer data. Thus, Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar, individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a system where communication between the wireless terminal device and the wireless server device is executed by being converted into a command and a parameter in which an amount of communication data is reduced, as recited in Applicant's independent claims 4 and 5. Therefore, claim 4 is not anticipated by Weisshaar, and claim 5 would not have been obvious from the combination of Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar at least for this reason.

With regard to claims 7 and 8, Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar describe an arrangement where HTTP, TCP/IP and UDP/IP may be used. However, neither of these references discloses or suggests processing of, for example, error-retry, error-recovery, and control of transfer, the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Appln, No.: 09/996,750

Att. Docket No.: Q67505

caching of packets and the surveying of error in a further superior layer of protocol. Thus, Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar, individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest a system where a wireless communication protocol between the wireless terminal device and the wireless server device implements a means for assuring communication quality in a wireless section as a protocol, as recited in Applicant's independent claims 7 and 8. Therefore, claim 7 is not anticipated by Weisshaar, and claim 8 would not have been obvious from the combination of Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar at least for this reason.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stan Torgovitsky
Registration No. 43,958

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 8, 2004